

manually cutting the screen. This is discussed in lines 27 to 30 of page 22 and lines 26 to 30 of page 23.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 5, 6, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17 through 20, 24 through 30, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as anticipated by the Hitachi product literature. The applicants respectfully disagree that any of these claims are anticipated by this reference.

The Hitachi product literature shows a holographic screen. Typically holographic screens are transparent and the Hitachi literature expressly states that the screen is transparent. In contrast claim 1 recites that the screen includes a “light absorbing layer for rendering the screen substantially opaque in ambient lit conditions when no image is projected on the screen by the projector.” Claim 11 recites that the screen includes “light absorbing means … so that the screen appears substantially dark in ambient lit conditions when no light is projected on the screen from the projector.” Claim 24 recites “the screen having light absorbing means for absorbing ambient light.” These limitations are not only not met by the Hitachi literature, they go against the specific teaching of this reference. Clearly none of these independent claims is anticipated by the Hitachi literature. Since the remaining claims in this rejection are dependent on one of these independent claims, they are not anticipated either. The applicants do not concede that these claims do not have limitations that distinguish from the teaching of this reference, but do not address this issue at this time since the limitations described clearly prevent the claims from being anticipated.

The Examiner has rejected claims 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by United States patent 6,337,769 (“Lee”). The applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner that the Lee patent anticipates these claims. First, the Examiner states “The examiner takes Official Notice that blinds are attached by removable mechanical fasteners. The applicants expressly object to the Examiner’s use of Official Notice in this instance. While it is possible that some blinds may be attached by removable mechanical fasteners, they are not necessarily so attached. There is nothing in the Lee patent that would suggest this form of attachment. Since the Examiner cannot show that this Notice applies to the specific blinds taught by Lee, the use of Official Notice is improper and Lee reference does not anticipate these claims. Furthermore there is no teaching whatsoever in the Lee patent that would suggest that the screen taught therein includes “light absorbing layer for rendering the screen substantially opaque in ambient lit conditions when no image is projected on the screen by the projector.” Clearly therefore, these claims are not anticipated by the Lee reference.

The Examiner has rejected claims 2 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as obvious in view of the Hitachi product literature. However, since these claims include by dependency the limitation of claim 1 that the screen includes a light absorber that causes it to appear opaque in ambient light when no image is projected on it and the Hitachi literature specifically teaches away from this, i.e. that the screen is transparent, it would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the screen taught in the Hitachi literature to meet the limitations of these claims. Clearly they are not obvious in light of this literature.

The Examiner has rejected claims 4, 7, 8, 16, and 33 through 40 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as obvious in view of the Hitachi product literature in combination with either United States patent 5,563,738 ("Vance") or United States patent 3,510,197 ("Seki *et al.*"). The applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner that the present invention is obvious in view of these references or that these patents are even properly combinable with the Hitachi product literature. If the either of these patents were combined with the Hitachi literature, the screen resulting screen would no longer be transparent, as is emphasized as a feature in the Hitachi literature. Furthermore, the screen taught by the Seki *et al.* patent is a reflective screen that is used only for front projection. It is not clear that designs for front projection screens that depend on reflection will also work for rear projection systems that depend on transmission. Clearly, the inventions of these claims cannot be said to be obvious in view of these references.

The Examiner has rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as obvious in view of the Hitachi product literature in combination with either United States patent 4,095,013 ("Burger") or United States patent 6,171,681 ("Mascarenhas *et al.*"). The applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner that the invention of claim 21 would be obvious in view of these references. First, contrary to the Examiner's statement that both of these patents "teach that it was known to produce non holographic/beaded screens" neither suggest anything about use as a projection screen. It is not clear that one of skill in the art of projection screens would turn to these patents in designing a screen. However, even if the combination of references suggested by the Examiner were made, the resulting article would still lack "light absorbing means ... so that the screen appears substantially dark in ambient lit conditions when no light is projected on the screen from the projector." Clearly therefore, claim 21 is not obvious in view of these references.

Finally, the Examiner has rejected claims 22 and 23 as under 35 U.S.C. §103 as obvious in view of the Lee patent in combination with either the Vance patent or the Seki *et al.* patent. It is not

clear that either the Vance patent or the Seki *et al.* patent is properly combinable with the Lee patent, but even if the combination were made, the result would still lack "light absorbing means ... so that the screen appears substantially dark in ambient lit conditions when no light is projected on the screen from the projector." Therefore the invention of claims 22 and 23 is not obvious in view of these references.

Because the present invention, as defined by the pending claims, is clearly adequately disclosed to enable one of skill in the art to practice the invention and is neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of the cited references, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the current rejections and allow all claims now pending in this application.

Respectfully submitted,

March 20, 2003

Date

By:



Stephen W. Buckingham, Reg. No.: 30,035
Telephone No.: 651-733-3379

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833